



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/077,207 05/26/98 INQUE S JA040840

OLIFF & BERRIDGE
PO BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA VA 22320

MMC1/0518

EXAMINER

PRENTY, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED:

05/18/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/077,207

Applicant(s)
INOUE et al.

Examiner
Prenty

Group Art Unit
2822



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 26, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7-9, and 14-17 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 10-13, and 18-21 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

This Office Action is in response to the papers filed May 26, 1998.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 9 is unclear in reciting "wherein said radiating extension extends from both sides of said source-drain region" because claim 7, upon which claim 9 depends, recites "wherein said radiating extension extends from both sides of said channel region." Claim 9 should apparently depend on claim 1.

Claims 1 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama et al. (United States Patent 5,616,935). See Koyama et al's Figure 2A, for example. Note the source-drain wiring layer extension.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kerber et al. (United States Patent 5,623,155). See Kerber et al's Figure 1, for example. Note the gate and channel extensions.

Claims 1-3, 9, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Han et al. (United States Patent 5,920,085). See Han et al's Figure 4, for example. Note the gate and source/drain extensions.

Claims 1, 9, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (United States Patent 5,959,313). See Yamazaki et al's Figures 3 and 6, for example. Note the source/drain extensions.

Claims 1-3, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al. (United States Patent 6,064,090). See Miyamoto et al's Figures 2, 14 and 31, for example. Note the gate extension.

Claims 4-6, 10-13 and 18-21 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable over the prior art of record if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Registered practitioners can telephone examiner Prenty at (703) 308-4939.
All other parties should telephone (703) 308-0956.

Mark Prenty
Mark V. Prenty
Primary Examiner